DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 839 SP 008 207

AUTHOR Gossen, Harvey A.
TITLE Pupil Control in Student Teaching.
NOTE 11p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Class Management; Educational Research; *Socioeconomic Background; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In this project, the concept of pupil control ideology was studied as it applied to student teachers. Those students at Central Missouri State University who were completing their student teaching experience during the winter and spring terms of 1970 participated in the study. The two hypotheses tested were that a) there will be no significant difference in the mean scores of pupil control ideologies of student teachers from different socioeconomic backgrounds and b) there will be no significant change in the pupil control ideology of teachers in the primary grades group with respect to their pretest and posttest scores. The measurement instrument was the Pupil Control Ideology form. Within the limitations of the study, both null hypotheses were accepted. The findings suggest that belief orientations that student teachers hold about pupil control are not influenced significantly by the effects of differing socioeconomic status and that the student teacher's perceptions of life in the classroom relative to pupil control and his actual experiences in the classroom are fairly congruent. (Author/HMD)

ED 093839

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PUPIL CONTROL IN STUDENT TEACHING

Harvey A. Gossen

Traditionally, the act of teaching has been conceived of as simply the transmission of knowledge from a teacher--presumably a person of above average intelligence--to a group of society's neophytes. The educational spotlight was on the teacher, the students comprised the audience, and communication was by-and-large one way--from teacher to student.

More recently an increasing amount of attention has been directed to the relationship between student and teacher. Evidence of this may be seen in the emphasis given to the affective domain in establishing instructional objectives. The feelings of students have thus taken on an unprecedented importance. Equally significant in the teacher-student relationship are the feelings of the teacher in the teaching act. Richardson describes this teacher-student relationship as ". . . a network of feelings, attitudes and expectations binding the teacher both to his individual pupils and to his class as a whole."[1] Waller refers to this relationship as a confrontation. "Teacher and pupil confront each other with attitudes from which the underlying hostility can never be altogether removed."[2]

A quick survey of student teachers will generally reveal that as they enter their student teaching assignments, their greatest fears center on this teacher-student relationship, and not on their command of content areas to be taught. The student teacher generally sees his ability to control students as one of the major criteria of his success or failure in student teaching, and this belief is usually given staunch support by those who supervise his activities and evaluate his work. Work done by Fuller, Pilgrim and Freeland suggests that control problems are a major concern of student teachers.[3]

SP008 207

Abbott has written about the function of ideology as an intervening variable in effecting a person's perceptions of his organizational role expectations.[4] Hoy makes application of this concept in establishing the use of the pupil control ideology as providing "an internal guide to action" for studying the behavior of student teachers.[5]

Pupil Control Ideology

The Gilbert and Levinson study of the patient control ideology held by mental hospital staff members[6] stimulated Willower, Eidell and Hoy to conceptualize a similar scheme for teacher-student relationships.[7] This was called the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form).

Operationalizing a measure of pupil control orientation was accomplished through a twenty item instrument utilizing a Likert-type scale. Items were scored using a numerical scale ranging from 1 to 5. The higher the score the more custodial the pupil control ideology of the respondent.

Validity of the PCI Form was established by asking principals to identify a specified number of teachers considered to be highly custodial or humanistic. Approximately 15 per cent of the faculty was identified with each type. Mean scores for each group were compared using a T test of the difference of means. A one-tailed test produced a T value of 2.639, indicating a difference in the expected direction at a .01 level of significance. A cross-validation using a new sample and similar techniques was significant at the .001 level.[8]

By correlating even with odd-item subscores, a split-half reliability was calculated. The Pearson product-moment coefficient was .91 and the Spearman-Brown correct coefficient was .95.[9]

Prototypes of humanistic and custodial orientations may be briefly described as follows: "The model of the humanistic orientation is . . . Students' learning and behavior is viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than moralistic terms . . . The humanistic teacher is optimistic that, through close personal relationships with pupils and the positive aspects of friendship and respect, students will be self-disciplining rather than disciplined."[10]

"The rigidly traditional school serves as a model for custodial orientation. This kind of organization provides a highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order . . . Pessimism and watchful mistrust imbue the custodial viewpoint . . . Both power and communication flow downward, and students are expected to accept the decisions of teachers without question."[11]

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

One variable under consideration in this study of pupil control ideology of student teachers was that of the socioeconomic background of the student teacher. The first impulse of the writers was to simply predict that people of different socioeconomic backgrounds would vary significantly in their pupil control ideology. This seemed reasonable in the light of the general agreement in the literature that child rearing differs by SES groups and consequently values established vary as well.[12, 13, 14] Furthermore, Carlson has found that ". . . teachers see education as the goal with middle and upper class children but substitute discipline as the goal with lower class children."[15] It seemed likely that a teacher originating in the lower classes would teach as she was taught. However, this kind of rationalizing would ignore the "melting pot" effect of three to four years of college life. Etzioni suggests that even though the personality structure has basically been established, that the

". . . learning of specific skills and role orientations continues with every change of status, in particular with membership in new social units, such as organizations."[16]

Hoy says that ". . . few members can escape the formative influence of the values, expectations, incentives, and sanctions of the organization."[17] Thus it becomes evident that, in fact, one might expect the pupil control ideologies of students preparing for teaching to steadily move toward a level of commonality. Therefore, if the influence of SES has been dissipated or reorganized, one might well expect that there would be no significant difference in the pupil control ideologies of beginning student teachers with respect to their socioeconomic background.

The NORC Occupational Prestige Scale was an outgrowth of work done by Alba Edwards in classifying occupations for the Bureau of the Census. North and Hatt chose ninety occupations and asked a quota sample of 2,920 people in the United States to rank these in order of prestige. Two items were given alternate titles, so 88 occupations were actually listed.[18] These occupations were rated as poor, somewhat below average, average, good, and excellent.[19] Numerical values 1 through 5 respectively were assigned to those ratings. The frequencies for each rating were reduced to percentages and averaged for all five ratings. "Don't know" responses were excluded. The highest average score was ranked as the number one prestige occupation.

The reliability of the NORC Scale was established in 1963 when Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi replicated the 1947 NORC study. They found a .99 correlation on the rank order of occupational listings.[20]

This listing of occupations was divided into five categories by Kahl.[21] For the purposes of this study the groups including semi-skilled and unskilled

workers were grouped together under the title low SES. The semi-professional and professional groups composed the high SES group, and the skilled workers made up the middle SES group.

Hypotheses

Several hypotheses were considered for this study. First and foremost was the following:

H. 1. There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of the pupil control ideologies of student teachers from different socioeconomic backgrounds.

Another hypothesis under consideration was based on sheer experience of working in supervision of student teaching. On an informal basis, student teachers were asked by the writers to identify what they perceived to be the potentially most threatening problem they faced as they were beginning their student teaching experience. Almost without fail this was identified as pupil control. The same problem was posed again at the completion of student teaching. There was an almost consistent change for the lower primary teachers this time. Now the major problem had become the utilization of time. On the strength of this feedback, the following prediction was made:

H. 2. There will be no significant change in the pupil control ideology of teachers in the primary grades group with respect to their pre-test and post-test scores.

Procedure

During the winter term (1969-1970) and the spring term (1970), all Central Missouri State University student teachers were asked to respond to the

Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) two times--once immediately prior to the beginning of their student teaching and again eleven weeks later, immediately after completing their student teaching.

The forms were originally administered to 433 student teachers. The use of the last four digits of their social security numbers for matching pre and post forms was utilized. No names were requested. Of these 433, thirty-one were not used in that they either could not be matched, or the subject had previous contract teaching experience. Of the 402 subjects included in the study, 84 fell into the low SES group, while 249 and 69 respectively fell into the middle and high SES groups.

Findings

A single classification Analysis of Variance was employed to compare the group means of the three SES groups. The results for H. 1 are shown in Table I. Since the computed F value is not significant, neither approaching significance, it was deemed unnecessary to check for any significant differences between any pairs of groups. The null hypothesis H. 1 is accepted.

TABLE I

A Comparison of PCI Form Scores by SES Groups

Source of Variation	DF	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Total	401	15484.2942		
Between	2	18.6876	9.3438	0.241*
Within	399	15465.6390	38.7610	

*The required value for significance at the .05 level is 19.50.

The results for H. 2 comparing the pre and post-student teaching PCI Form scores of primary grade student teachers are shown in Table II. Since the

computed F value is less than the required value, the null hypothesis H. 2 is accepted.

TABLE II

A Comparison of Pre and Post Student Teaching PCI Form Scores of Primary Grade Teachers (K-3)

Source of Variation	DF	Mean Squares	F
Trials	1	59.0625	2.972*
Between Subjects	109	61.0999	
Residual	109	19.8716	
Total	219	40.5656	

*The required value for significance at the .05 level is 3.93.

Discussion

The findings suggest that belief orientations which student teachers hold about pupil control are not influenced significantly by the effects of differing socioeconomic status. It should be remembered that this study reflects only the behavior of students from one school. It should also be noted that there was a considerable difference in the male-female ratio of the three groups, and no attempt was made to control this variable. The low SES group had a 2 to 3 male-female ratio, the middle SES group a 1 to 3 male-female ratio, and the high SES group a 1 to 4 male-female ratio. Further study may be fruitful if not only the sex variable would be controlled, but also if the variable of teaching level (elementary, secondary) would be controlled at the same time.

The findings concerning H. 2 certainly deserve further study. It would appear that the data suggests that the student teacher's perceptions of life in the classroom relative to pupil control and his actual experiences in the

classroom are fairly congruent. If further study would support this finding, it would seem that work could then be done to attempt to isolate the factors which contribute to this potential difference between primary grade teachers and other teaching levels.

Additional Developments

In addition to testing the two hypotheses, the data was perused in search of possible results which might warrant further investigation. No hypotheses were developed. This section represents simply the following of a "hunch", without any well defined rationale.

The male teachers were found to be more custodial than female teachers—a finding previously reported by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy.[22] Hoy also found student teachers to become more custodial in their pupil control ideology during the student teaching term.[23] This study found that not only were males more custodial in their pupil control ideology than were females prior to the student teaching experience, but that the males became more custodial in their pupil control ideology at a significantly greater rate during student teaching than did the female teachers.

A similar finding was noticed when student teachers' PCI Form scores were compared by their level of teaching assignments. The secondary teachers were significantly more custodial in their pupil control ideology than were elementary teachers. Similar information was reported by Willower, Eidell and Hoy in the original monograph.[24] This study found the secondary teachers becoming more custodial in their pupil control ideology at a significantly greater rate during the course of their student teaching term.

The writers compared the post student teaching scores on the PCI Form of the Social Studies and English student teachers with the Art, Music, and

Foreign Language student teachers. It was conjectured that the teachers of courses which were usually "required" of all students might be more custodial than the teachers of electives. However, there was no significant difference in these two groups.

The PCI Form scores of the Art, Music, and Foreign Language student teachers were also compared with those scores of two other groups. The writers felt the responsibility of the Physical Education and Industrial Arts student teachers for the physical safety of their students might cause them to be more custodial than the other groups. This difference did not prove to be significant at the .05 level, although it did approach significance with an F score of 3.143 while 3.95 was needed.

The Home Economics, Industrial Arts and Business student teachers also did not prove to be significantly more custodial, as shown by their PCI Form scores, than their colleagues in Art, Music, and Foreign Languages. A significant difference was approached, however. The assumption had been that the teachers in the skill subjects might be more custodial than those in elective subjects more closely allied to the creative aspects of learning.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Elizabeth Richardson; The Environment of Learning (Camden, New Jersey, 1967), p. 126.

[2]Willard Waller, Sociology of Teaching (New York, 1932), p. 196.

[3]Frances F. Fuller, Geneva H. Pilgrim, and Alma M. Freeland, "Intensive Individualization of Teacher Preparation", 1967 Yearbook of Association for Student Teaching, p. 151-187.

[4]Max G. Abbott, "Intervening Variables in Organizational Behavior", Educational Administration Quarterly I (Winter, 1965), p. 1-13.

[5]Wayne K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology", The Journal of Educational Research, (Vol. 61, No. 4, Dec. 1967), p. 153.

[6]Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel Levinson, "'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and Staff Ideology", The Patient and the Mental Hospital, Milton Greenblatt, Daniel J. Levinson, and Richard H. Williams, Ed. (Glencoe, Illinois, 1957), pp. 20-35.

[7]Donald J. Willower, Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy, "The School and Pupil Control Ideology", The Pennsylvania State Studies No. 24, (University Park, 1967), p. 5.

[8]Ibid., p. 13.

[9]Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[10]Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[11]Ibid., p. 5.

[12]E. M. Duvall, "Conceptions of Parenthood", American Journal of Sociology LII. (1946-47), pp. 190-192.

[13]Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education, (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1967), p. 30.

[14]Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space", Readings in Social Psychology, Maccoby et al, Ed., (New York, 1958), p. 423.

[15]Richard O. Carlson "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences : The Public School and Its Clients (Behavioral Science and Educational Administration)", N.S.S.E. 63rd Yearbook, Part II, (1964), p. 270.

[16]Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, (New York: The Free Press, 1961), p. 182.

[17]Wayne K. Hoy, "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," School Review LXXVI, No. 3, (September, 1968), p. 315.

[18]Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status, (New York, 1961), p. 47

[19]Ibid., p. 53.

[20]Robert W. Hodge, Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi, "Occupational Prestige in the United States 1925-1963", The American Journal of Sociology, LXX, (1964), pp. 286-304.

[21]Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure, (New York, 1957), pp. 76-77.

[22]Willower, Eidell and Hoy, p. 30.

[23]Wayne K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology", The Journal of Educational Research, (Vol. 61, No. 4, Dec. 1967), pp. 153-155.

[24]Willower, Eidell and Hoy, pp. 32-35.